Department of L. R. & Ag.

OFFICE ~~of the~~ Bd of Rev.

STATION Madras.

Mis No. 504

Dated 12. 2. 32.

G 5 140, 30.

	Date	Initial
Given for copying		
Copied		
Examined		
Signed		
Given for despatch		
Despatched		
Indexed		
To be destroyed on*		

Whom sent

Call - noted
+ sworn trial dt. [illegible]

(SUBJECT.)

Settlement - Resettlement - (Srikakulam) - Management of estates - unauthorised occupations in Inamdars - assessed wastes - Cases to collectors recorded.



S E T T L E M E N T. DEPARTMENT

95740
36747

In reply, please quote number, date and short

Received ..... *Registered* .....



From (Name) W.R.S. Sathianadhan Esquire, I.C.S.,

(Designation) Special Settlement Officer Party No.IV,

Post Box ....., (Station) Cannanore.

Telegraphic Address .....

To The Secretary to the Commissioners
of Land Revenue and Settlement,
Chepauk, M A D R A S.

No. ....., *dated* 3rd November 19 30.

Enclosures Nil.
Sent separately by
Regd Parcel Service (Nil)
Spare Copies 30/Mc 3089 5-11-30.

Settlement - Resettlement - South Kanara district Mangalore and Puttur taluks - Unauthorised occupatio in Kumakis and assessed waste lands - Interim report submitted.

A 28(V) B.P.Mis.No.1012, dated 8th April 1929.

In paragraph 4(4) of G.O.No.Mis.666, Revenue Department dated the 27th March 1929, communicated with B.P. Mis.No. 1012, dated 8th April 1929, quoted above, the Government ordered the Special Settlement Officer to obtain from the village officers and submit to them lists of unauthorised occupations of kumakis and assessed waste lands in all villages, where no resurvey had been made or would be made, with an estimate of their area and the assessment (the rate appropriate to their condition being assumed) that would be on them. With a view to saving time and to saving expense in overchecking these lists, my predecessor, Mr. MacEwen, suggested to the Board in paragraph 3(v) of his letter R.O.C.391/Mis.29-3, dated 9-6-1929, that it would be sufficient for the purpose in view if such lists were compiled in two taluks, Mangalore and Puttur, and the Board, in paragraph 3(v) of its proceedings Mis.No.2620, dated 2nd September 1929, accepted his proposal.

2. Instructions for the preparation of the lists called for, were issued to the shanbogues in the month

of November 1929. The lists relating to Mangalore taluk were required to be submitted to the Branch office at Mangalore and those relating to Puttur taluk to the branch office at Kasaragod. A Branch office was opened at Mangalore i 1930. The over-check of the lists of both the taluks w taken up by the Settlement field staff from May 1930.

So far, 57 out of the 151 non-resurveyed villages of Mangalore taluk have been completed by Settlement Inspectors. Their work was checked in 22 villages by the Additional Supervisor; the Special Assistant Settlement Officer passed 27 villages after inspection including 13 villages not inspected by the Additional Supervisor. In Puttur, over-check of the lists by Inspectors has been completed in 112 out of the 151 non-resurveyed villages (including the 2 villages recently transferred from Mangalore). Their work was checked by the Additional Supervisor in 45 villages, while the Special Assistant Settlement Officer (one Special Assistant Settlement Officer for Mangalore, Puttur and Kasaragod) passed 57 villages including 17 villages not scrutinsed by the Additional Supervisor. Sketches have been prepared by the Settlement staff in respect of all occupations of 20 cents and above, which is the limit adopted for the subdivision of occupations in unoccupied dry lands in Malabar(Vide B.P.Mis.No.3620, dated 29-10-1928). For occupations of between 5 and 20 cents, no sketches have been prepared, but the state of ground has been recorded in the inspection registers. The above procedure ensures the exclusion of petty cases of occupations of below 5 cents, following the district practice and of all cases where there is any doubt of the accuracy of old survey

3. Detailed lists showing the results of over-check in the villages so far dealt with in the two taluks together with abstracts thereof are herewith submitted. It will be seen from the abstracts, that out of the 57 villages dealt with in Mangalore taluk, there are no assessed waste lands in 3 villages; in 11 villages there are assessed waste lands with no occupations there in; in 2 villages the occupations are between 5 and 20 cents only; in the remaining 41 villages, occupations of 20 cents and above cover approximately an area of 300.59 acres and those of between

5 and 20 cents an area of 34.98 acres. The assessment that can be imposed on occupations of 20 cents and above according to reclassification principles is Rs.421-6-0 and that on occupations of between 5 and 20 cents according to the adangal rate is Rs.31-3-0; while the total extent and the assessment charged under sivayijama by the Revenue Department in the villages dealt with, according to the revenue accounts of fasli 1339, are 59.45 acres and Rs.55-7-0 respectively.

In Puttur, statistics have been gathered for 108 out of the 112 villages so far dealt with by the Settlement staff. Out of the former, there are no cases of occupations of 20 cents and above in 4 villages; in the remaining 104 villages, the total extent of occupations of 20 cents and above is approximately 1170.10 acres and those between 5 and 20 cents in all the 108 villages is 215.07 acres. The assessment that can be imposed on occupations of 20 cents and above according to reclassification principles is Rs.1525-14-0 and that on occupations between 5 and 20 cents according to the adangal rate is Rs.135-1-0; while the total extent and the assessment charged under sivayijama by the Revenue Department in the villages dealt with, according to the revenue accounts of fasli 1339, are 118.60 acres and Rs.59-2-0 respectively. From the above figures, it appears that the shanbogues have not been zealous in booking all the cases of effective occupations. In certain villages, there is a great difference between the sivayijama assessment actually collected in the last fasli and the amount that could actually have been collected had proper attention been paid. Another point noticed is that the occupations are generally found to be scattered and seldom in compact blocks the occupations by way of wet and garden are not much. Most of the cases of occupations are in non-kumakis

question whether assignments of unauthorised ~~xxx~~ occupations need be made in the course of ~~xx~~ resettlement operations or not. Whatever may be decided on this question, it seems to me desirable that, as inspections have progressed so far, the over-check of shanbogues' lists should be completed in the taluks of Mangalore and Puttur on the lines hitherto followed. The number of cases of unauthorised occupations detected so far does not seem to be sufficient to justify a systematic inspection by the Settlement staff of assessed wastes on shanbogues' lists in the remaining taluks. In these taluks, unauthorised occupations in assessed waste that may be wet or garden on ground will be dealt with in the course of inspection for reclassification purposes; as for the other kinds of unauthorised occupations in assessed waste, it will be sufficient, I think, to deal with any glaring cases of omission on the part of the Revenue Department, that may be detected in the course of inspection for other purposes. I submit that no list of unauthorised occupations in assessed waste need be called for from shanbogues for these taluks.

5. If I am to be authorised to make assignments in the non-resurveyed villages of the taluks of Mangalore and Puttur in particular, I submit, that so far as Mangalore taluk is concerned, which is due for resettlement in 1932-33, all cases of 20 cents and above may be assigned after measurement in the course of supplemental survey before rough patta objection hearing, which will be some time in 1932; cases of between 5 and 20 cents may be listed and sent to the Revenue Department for action under sivayijama in due course. There is however one point to be considered in this connection with regard to the over-check of the shanbogues' lists, the formalities prescribed in paragraph 4 of appendix to B.P.No.4 Press, dated 14th January 1929, - (1) the giving of 10 days' notice to parties of the assigning officer's intended visit to the village by beat of tom-tom, and (2) the holding of a summary enquiry in the village by the assigning officer, noting down the results including any objections that may be raised and recording his

provisional decision - have not been followed. The observance of these formalities, however, does not appear to be very material; the rough pattas to be issued to parties later on will constitute a formal notice of provisional assignment to them. In the Puttur taluk, which is due for resettlement in 1934-35, the assignment, if ordered, in respect of cases of 20 cents and above will have to lie over until resettlement, it being obviously not possible to get them measured in advance, though cases of between 5 and 20 cents may be sent to the Revenue Department immediately for action under sivayijama. If it is considered unnecessary to make assignment of unauthorised occupations in the course of resettlement operations even in Mangalore and Puttur, can send the records prepared by my staff to the Revenue Department for necessary action; but still, all cases of occupations of 20 cents and above that are wet or garden on ground will necessarily have to be measured as separate subdivisions as a result of reclassification, and the subdivisions so measured will be shown in the resettlement accounts as assessed waste, wet or garden with the appropriate rate of assessment.

Pending orders on this report, inspection of unauthorised occupations in Mangalore and Puttur taluks is being continued. Only one Additional Supervisor is working in Mangalore taluk, although there is provision for two. No Additional Supervisor is working at present in Puttur taluk, after the Additional Supervisor who was working there was transferred as permanent Head Clerk to Party No.III. The Special Assistant Settlement Officer, Kasaragod has been instructed to inspect cases in Puttur direct after Inspectors' inspection. If, as I hope, final orders on this subject will be passed on the data furnished ~~by me~~ now, there is no hurry to complete the work in Mangalore and Puttur. But, if the Board wishes to defer passing final orders until all the villages in

Puttur and Mangalore taluks are inspected for unauthorised occu
pations in assessed waste. I shall immediately increase the
inspecting staff and submit a final report on the 2 taluks
with the least possible delay.

S. Padmanabhaiah
or Special Settlement Officer.

5-11-30

DESPATCHED
NOV1930

Subject.-

Settlement - Resettlement - South Kanara Dt - Mangalore and Puttur Tks - Unauthorized occupations in kumaki and assessed waste lands - Inspection Report

READ AGAIN B. P. No. _____, dated _____ 193

" " " _____, " _____ 193

READ ALSO :--

8 Register No. 5140-Q From the _____, No. _____, dated _____ 193

" "_____, " "_____, "_____, "_____ 193

" "_____, " "_____, "_____, "_____ 193

2 more detailed report in the light of the estimates that may be arrived at. The work in the two tables in question should be continued until further orders

21.11.30 (+0)

21.11.30

24.11.30

25.11.30

Roc 407/B&C/29-19 9

Revenue Settlement Office,
Party No.IV, Cannanore.
Dated 23rd ~~March~~ February 1931.

9844

From

W.R.S. Sathianadhan Esquire, I.C.S.,
Special Settlement Officer, Party No.IV.

The Secretary to the Commissioners
of Land Revenue and Setttlement,
Chepauk, M A D R A S.

Enclosure
re Statement
Village-wise statistics
in connection with
B.P. 24.2.31

M-7-8 cf

Settlement - Resettlement - South Kanara district Mangalore and Puttur taluks - unauthorised occupatic in kumakis and assessed wastelands - Estimates of probable results - detailed report submitted.

Board's reference G.5140/30-1, dated 25-11-30.

Adverting to the Board's reference quoted above, I beg to submit herewith a statement, in which items I and II show the results of inspection of unauthorised - occupations in kumakis and assessed waste lands in 57 and 108 non-resurveyed villages dealt with already in the Mangalore and Puttur taluks respectively, item III the combined results of items I and II, and ~~ix~~ items IV and V, the approximate estimates, for the whole of the non-resurveyed area of the taluks of Mangalore and Puttur and of the district as a whole respectively, worked out by taking the comparative areas of the villages already dealt with.

p13 infra.

2. The figures shown in columns 5 and 6 of the statement (sivayijama extent and assessment) do not - include extents which were noted as hakkal (i.e.cultivation not of a permanent nature) in the revenue accounts and which were found to be such on inspection. These extents, together with the assessments thereon, are shown separately in the remarks column ~~separately~~ of the statement. Again the figures in columns 5 and 6 against itemsI and II ~~are~~ differ from those reported in paragraph 3 of my letter R.O.C.407/B&C.29-10, dated 3-11-30. This is due to the fact that, in respect of Mangalore, the

latter figures included the hakkal extent and assessment, while in respect of Puttur, they excluded certain items of sivayi-jama cultivation that ought to have been included in them.

In respect of the 165 villages, actually inspected in Mangalore and Puttur, while the sivayijama extent brought to book by the Revenue department and the assessment thereon are 714 acres - 94 cents and Rs.406-14-0 respectively, the excess over the above area, detected as under occupation on inspection by the Settlement staff, is 1005 acres, 80 cents, involging an excess of Rs.1706 - 10 - 0 in assessment or an increase of 140.7 % in extent and 419.41 % in assessment. The corresponding percentages, when the non-resurveyed areas of the who Mangalore and Puttur taluks are taken into consideration, are 144.46 % and 433.44: those arrived at for the whole of the non-resurveyed area of the district are 63.9% and 106.25. The above excesses, however, represent but a small fraction of the total extent and assessment of assessed waste lands in the respective areas as shown in columns 14 and 16 of the statement.

I regret the delay in submission of this report. It was due to the fact that the particulars required for the preparation of the statement submitted herewith had to be obtained by the Tahsildars from the shanbogues, which took time.

6. The enclosures received with the Board's reference under reply, are resubmitted.

S. Padmanabharao

P.S.U/23-2 For Special Settlement Officer.

14.2.31.

DESPATCHED

Settlement -- Resettlement - South Kanara Dt - Mangalore and Puttur Tks - Unauthorised occupations of burnams and assessed waste lands - Estimates of probable results.

G. 844 - Q /p 9 ēē.

Ref. S. Proc. - 30-2 dt 12.3.31

The Board observes from the statement subd. with the letter read above that the assessment shown in Column 4 against item V is over 3½ times the assessment shown in that column against item III; while the estimated extra revenue shown in Col. 15 against item V is less than double that against item III. The probable extra revenue for the whole Dt. should work out to Rs 6000/, approx instead of Rs 3211-13-0. The S.S.O. is requested to report how the amount of Rs 3211.13.0 was ~~The figures in the statem~~ worked at and to return ~~referred to above~~ recpt

~~carefully examination of the~~

~~S. S. O~~ ~~is~~ ~~accordingly~~ ~~requested~~

~~to reexamine~~ the figures given in the Statement and report whether the height of the above items by Engineer Surveyor and submit a report as to their accuracy at an early date

(J. O)

Roc 407/B4c/29-20.

Revenue Settlement Office,
Party No.IV, Cannanore,
Dated 17th March 1931.

Fro

W.R.S.Sathianadhan Esquire, I.C.S.,
Special Settlement Officer.

To

The Secretary to the Commissioners of
Land Revenue and Settlement,
Chepauk, M A D R A S.

Settlement - Resettlement (South Kanara) Mangalore and Puttur taluks - Un-authorised occupations in kumakis and assessed waste lands - probable results - how worked out - report submitted.

Pp 15-16 CF

40-30-2, dated 12-3-31.

The Board observes that the assessment shown in column 4 against item V is over 3½ times the assessment shown in that column against item III, while the estimated extra revenue shown in column 15 against item V is less than double that against item III. To elucidate the above result, the following points should be noted:--

(1) The estimates shown in columns 7 to 10 against item V have been arrived at by applying to the actuals in the same columns against item III, the ratio between the area of assessed waste lands for the district as a whole shown in column 3 against item V and the area of similar lands for the 165 villages shown in the same column against item III, such ratio being 2.95:1.

(2) The estimate (Rs 3211-13-0) shown in column 15 against item V has been arrived at by subtracting the figure in column 6 (actual sivaijama assessment collected by the Revenue Department for fasli 1339) from the estimated revenue shown in column 12.

against item V are 2.95 times larger than the actuals shown in the same columns against item III the actual sivajama assessment shown in column 6 against item V is larger than that shown in the same column against item III by as many as 7.43 times Thus the figures shown in the statement are correct

2. The Statement received with the Board's reference is resubmitted.

Subject.—

Settlement - Resettlement - Sm
Kanara Dt - Mangalore and Pub
Rs - Unauthorised occupation
Lemanes and assessed waste
Estimates of probable results

READ AGAIN B. P. No. _____, dated _____ 193

" " " _____, " _____ 193

READ ALSO :—

Register No. 1159 - Q. P. 17 e6 From the _____, No. _____, dated _____ 193

" " _____, " " _____, " _____, " _____ 193

" " _____, " " _____, " _____, " _____ 193

12-53

RESOLUTION. No. 5140-38m3

959 acs should be doone
relate to the old da
It is doubtful if te
tul alone contains 4 times equivalent
ques. The S.S.O. is
quested to report how
arrived at his figure
der 4 nos. renumbered as
(f.o)
6
6.31. Hs Uhr
10 4 31 11.4.31

2 Jamabandi Hale. No. 5
for fasli 1339 shows that the area
often cases occupied better or written
permission application for which
no pattas had been granted (item
in the Hale.) is 705 acs being
an assessment of Rs 1930. The C
of L.R. is requested to furnish a
early note tahsilwar details
for the entire ryotwari

BOARD OF REVENUE
20 APR 1931
LAND REVENUE AND SETTLEMENT

L.Dis.3842- South Kanara Collector's Office,

Mangalore, 16th April 1931.

From

Mr. J. Hussain, Bar-at-Law,

Collector of South Kanara.

To

The Secretary to the Board,

Land Revenue & Settlement,

Madras.

Sir,

Settlement - Resettlement - South Kanara - Mangalo and Puttur Taluks - Unauthorised occupations in kumkis a assessed waste lands - Estimates of probable results.

****

B.P.Reference No.G.5140/30-3, dated 11th April 19

****

Talukwar details for the extent and assessment are given below:-

Taluks.	Extent. Acres.	Assessment. Rs.
Mangalore	1158	2100
Kasargod	1905	2079
Puttur	1659	1047
Udipi	473	718
Coondapoor	238	249
Karkal	1624	1737
	7057	7930

G1M/2M 23

In replying please quote number, date and short title *

Settlement DEPARTMENT.

Received 22 APR 1931 Registered

From (Name) J.R.S. Sathianadhan Esquire, I.C.S.,

(Designation) Special Settlement Officer, Party No.IV

Post Box ..., (Station) Cannanore.

Telegraphic Address

To The Secretary to the Commissioners
of Land Revenue and Settlement,
Chepauk, Madras.

Sir, Roc No 407 29-23, dated 20th April 1931.
Proc

*

Settlement - Resettlement - South Kanara district Mangalore and Puttur taluks - unauthorised occupations in kumakis and assessed waste lands - Estimates of probable results.

Board's reference No.G.5140/30-3, dated 11-4-1931.

I submit, that reply to the Board's reference quoted

Enclosures

Spare Copies

Rp 19-20 Ets

above, will be submitted after receipt of jamabandi statements No.5 from Taluk Offices.

T. S. Varadarajulu Iyer
20/4/81

P.S.U/20-4

For Special Settlement Officer.

20/4/81

ATTACHED

Settlement - Resettlement - South Kanara Dist. Mangalore and Puttur Tks - Unauthorised occupation in kumaki and assessed waste lands - Estn of probable results -

S. 1468 - Q. p. 23 c

Ref. S. 5140 - 30.4 .31

The S.S.O. is requested to expedite the report called for in paragraph pp 19-20 cl of Board's Ref S. No 5140 dated 11.4.31

CM 18.5.31 Ltr 18.5.31 CQ. 5.31

Issue 1950

To the S.S.O. No IV Party Cannanore

L07 /29.27. SETTLEMENT - DEPARTMENT.

Revenue Settlement Office,
Party No.IV Cannanore,
Dated.25th M a y 1931.

From

W.R.S.Sathianadhan Esquire, I.C.S.,
Special Settlement Officer,
Cannanore.

To

The Secretary to the Commissioners of
Land Revenue and Settlement,
Chepauk, MADRAS.

Sir,

Settlement - Resettlement - South Kanara Distri
Mangalore and Puthur Taluks - Unauthorised
occupations in Kumakis and assessed waste land
Estimate of probable results - Board's referer
G.5140/30-4 dated 19-5-1931.

The Special Assistant Settlement Officer, has been requested to furnish certain particulars reference to Board's reference G.5140/30-3 dated and I shall submit my reply immediately on receip those particulars.

S. Padmanabh
For Special Settlement

25.5.31

DESPATCHI

Roc 407 Baudc 29-28 41 29 9 2043

Revenue Settlement Office,
Party No.IV, Cannanore,
Dated 4th June 1931.

From

W.R.S.Sathianadhan Esquire,I.C.S.,
Special Settlement Officer.

The Secretary to the Commissioners of
Land Revenue & Settlement,
Chepauk, MADRAS.

Settlement - Resettlement - South Kanara district - Mangalore and Puttur taluks - unauthorised occupations in kumakis and assessed waste lands - estimates of probable results -

Board's reference No.G.5140-30-3, dated 11-4-1931.

Pp 19-20 ad

With reference to the Board's reference quoted above, I submit herewith a comparative statement showing the figures according to the jamabandi statement No.5, for fasli 1339 and those furnished in the statement submitted to the Board with this office letter R.O.C.407/B&C.29-19, dated 23-2-1931. It will be seen therefrom that, excluding 1905.08 acres relating Kasaragod taluk (entirely re-surveyed), the total extent - according to the jamabandi statement for the five remaining taluks comes to 5152.21 acres, which includes an extent of 685 acres of hakkal cultivation, which has not been taken into - account in working out the financial statement (vide paragraph of my letter above referred to). Excluding the hakkal extent the total extent of assessed and unassessed lands in the five taluks, which has been occupied and for which no patta has - been granted, is 4467.19 acres (column 4 of the comparative statement enclosed); while, according to the statement submitt with this office letter quoted above, the total sivaijama exte is 3097.60 acres (column 8 of the comparative statement). The difference between the two figures is 1369.59 acres (column 9 of the comparative statement).

there is no difference in respect of the Karkal taluk. As regards Puttur, Coondapur and Udipi taluks, the difference is due to the fact that the sivaijama extents in assessed wastes and kumakis in the resurveyed areas and those in the unassessed lands, booked by the Revenue department in the entire taluks, have not been included in the figures furnished by this office. With regard to the Mangalore taluk, the difference is due to the fact that the figures shown in this office statement exclude, besides the items noted in the margin, the following others as now reported by the Special Assistant Settlement Officer, Mangalore:---

The areas booked by the Revenue department in assessed wastes and kumakis (a) in the 27 resurveyed villages, (b) in the 3 entire municipal villages and (c) in the intra-municipal portions of 5 partial municipal villages; and
the areas booked by the Revenue department in unassessed lands in the entire taluk.

(1) The areas assigned on darkhast by the Revenue department but not brought under holding pending plotting or the subdivisions in the field measurement books after scrutiny by the Inspecting Tahsildar and (2) the areas of kumaki land in certain villages once applied for for inclusion in holdings but only brought to sivaijama (No.7 accounts) by the Revenue department on the ground that they were required

Comparative statement showing the figures according to the J
furnished in the statement submitted to the Board wi

erial mber	Name of taluk	Total number of villages.	According to Taluk jamabandi statement no 5 for fasli 1339.						According to the Collector's jamabandi statement no 5 for fasli 1339,	
			Extent of cultivation with or with out application, of assessed and unassessed lands for which no patta has been granted.		Hakdal extent		Total (Columns 4 and 5)			
1	2	3	4		5		6		7	
			Acs	cents	Acs	cents	Acs	cents	Acs	
(1)	Mangalore.	Resurveyed 27 Municipal 3 Non-resurveyed 148 178	1077	81	80	16	1157	97	1158	
2	Puttur.	Resurveyed 33 Non-resurveyed 151 184	1296	45	362	53	1658	98	1659	
3	Karkal	All non-resurveyed- 105	1485	42	138	80	1624	22	1624	
4	Coondapur.	Resurveyed 2 Non-resurveyed 101 103	200	73	37	44	238	17	238	
5	Sedisu	Resurveyed 2 Non-resurveyed 113 115	406	78	66	09	472	87	473	
	Total	Resurveyed 64 Non-resurveyed 618 Municipal 3 685	4467	19	685	02	5152	21	5152	
6	Kasargod.	All resurveyed 114	869	01	1036	07	1905	08	1905	
	Grand total	799	5336	20	1721	09	7057	29	7057	

Statement No 5 for fasli 1339 and those this Office letter R.o.c. 407/13te-29-19 dated 23.2.31.

Situation extent according to the figures furnished in this office statement No 5 and [these figures exclude kolchal extent]		Differences between columns 4 and 8		Remarks
8		9		
Acs	cents	Acs	cents	
63	57	1014	24	
1020	21	276	24	
1485	42			
186	44	14	29	
341	96	64	82	
3097	60	1369	59	

R. P. XXII-A-19—99,600 22-4 30 (6)

FOR MEMBER

Subject.— 33 Settlement - Resettlement - South Kanara Dt - Mangalore and other taluks - Unauthorised occupations in kumkis and assessed wastes - Estimate of probable results

A.S (Clt)

READ AGAIN B. P. No. _____, dated _____ 193

" " " _____, " _____ 193

READ ALSO :—

Register No. _____, From the _____, No. _____, dated _____ 193

" " _____, " " _____, " _____, " _____ 193

" " _____, " " _____ 193

RESOLUTION. Ref ¶ No. 5140-30-5, dated 22-6 1931.

Ref Paragraph 4 (4) of G.O. No 661 Rev. dated 27.3.29

The Board has before it the report of the S.S.O called for in the above G.O. ~~Returning the~~ It proposes to put off submitting it to Govt pending their orders on reference S. No 4838-30-6, dated 15.5.31 in which it ~~the Board has~~ recommended the resurvey of taluks of Mangalore, Udipi, Coondapur, Karkal and Puttur ~~If~~ the resurvey of these taluks sanctioned the procedure laid down in ~~paragraph~~ 4 (2) and (3) the G.O. quoted above will have

to be adopted in dealing with
cases of unauthorized occupation
in Kumaun and assessed waste
The Board therefore proposes to
put off pronouncing the present
report pending the orders of
Govt on the question of the
recovery of these taluks. ~~In~~
~~this connection~~ the Board must
the attention of Govt to para
b of its reference ~~G.O. No. LRR-30~~ Quoted ab
~~dated 15-5-37~~ and requests that
Govt will be pleased to pass
early orders on the proposal to
recovery these taluks

R. F. XXII-A-19- 30,004—2-2-31 (6)

Subject.

FOR MEMBER.

A.S(Sett.) / Thro' F.

Settlement - Resettlement - (S. Kanara) - Mangalore and other taluks - Unauthorised occupations in Kumakis and assessed wastes - Correspondence recorded.

READ AGAIN B. P. No. _____, dated _____ 193

" " " _____, " _____ 193

READ ALSO :-- p1 cf — cf 5140/30 — Q to S.S.O only

Register No. _____ From the p21 cf — cf 1452/31 — No. Q to Collor only 193

p29 cf — cf 2043/31 — Q to S.J. ... 4

" " _____, " " _____, _____, " _____ 193

p33 cf — Bd's Reference cf 5140/30-520/22.6.31 — Q to

" " _____, " " _____, " _____ 193

RESOLUTION. No. 504, dated 12.2.1932

Recorded with reference to

1. O. No 2214 Press Rev S/21.10.31

2. ~~The S.S.O. in charge of the party~~ The S.S.O. is requested to take up the question of assignment of occupied waste lands after the question of the reserves and resettlement operations ~~in the S. Kanara dt is decided~~.

p157 of (J)

(Let this para. stand)

I send the O.P. to Secy Sum after Despatch. MW 12.2.32.

MW 12.2.32.

Ahe 12.2.32

To.
SASO in charge of
the S.S.O. No IV Party, Cannanore

MW 12.2.32

Ahe 12.2.32

with enclos returned.

Enclos Sum to Secy.

Ark Secy

MW 15.2.32

copy to the Collr of South Kanara, with a copy of cf. O No 2214 Press Rev S/21.10.31 — p157 of (J) to be copied.

Copy to Secy to govt. Q.D ✓

A 8 (setti)

Please see the letter from the S.S.O. No. IV Party at pp 1 - 6 of

paragraph 3 (ii) of RP mis No. 2620 of 2.9.29 the S.S.O was asked to prepare the lists called for in paragraph 4 (4) of G.O. No 661 Rev of 27.3. in respect of the villages of the Mangalore and Puttur taluks it will be seen from the S.S.O letter that the lists have not been prepared for all the villages in the two talukas where there will be no resurvey. The S.S.O states that the lists now submitted by him will provide sufficient data for passing final orders in the question whether assignments

of unauthorized occupations need be made in the course of resettlement operations or not. We add, however that it would be desirable to complete the work in all the villages ~~of the~~ wards into not be removed in the two talukas in question. For orders whether final orders may be deferred until all the villages in the two talukas are inspected for unauthorized occupation is assessed more.

Leo
11.80.

hx
15/10/0

Local orders on the basis of the S.S.O.'s report the overcrowding complained of in the two talukas may be stopped

KRey
17-11-30.

The S.S.O.'s report, tho' it gives figures, sets out these figures in such a way that one wld. think the object of the investigation was to catch out the V.O.s! That may be an incidental point, but the main object is to find out if it is worth while to examine the whole of S. Kan. for unauthorised encroachments, occupation of A.L. Originally I was to make a widespread investigation, wh. Bd. subsequently allowed me to make in Ulhas Nhang. Ths., as being typical settled jungly areas. The S.S.O. gives only figures of work he has done — no estimate of probable results, either the whole of these 2 Ths. or for the Dt. This can easily be done, at least an approx. figure reached, taking the comparative areas of the villages already done of the Ths.; a further, tho' less accurate, estimate cld. be made for the Dt. (I did the same thing in Bnal. & S. Kan. in connection with changes from dry to garden etc. not decent results on a much more slender basis than in this case). This may, I suggest, be done.

I think the area already inspected is ample for a report to Govt. Before submitting this to Govt,

Office will pl. note, for both Tks., the num
of villages already inspected as apt the total number
of villages in each Tk.

a little less than half has been done, the triangular
a bit over half.

With reg. to stopping field work, I doubt if
it is advisable, yet if the Dt. estimates put up by
the S.S.O (as suggested above) show, as I think they
will, a substantial area that has yet to be
covered, I do not see how we can refuse Govt
to [illegible] throughout the Dt. In that case
it might be as well to finish [illegible] while
the field staff is at its pitch to drop it & start again
later, once that the men are experienced & the work
organised. I suggest at least going on until we see
the S.S.O.'s estimates.

19.1.50.

Office to note on A
and then put to file.

pp. 7-8 C.F. | Issued as Govt's Ref S.No. 5140/80.1 d 28/4/80
pp 9-11 C.F. | S. 844/31. from the S.S.O. No. IV Partly

Please see the Note on pages 2 to 4 above and the S.S.O's report on pages 9 to 11 C.F.

The statement on p. 13 C.F. submitted by the S.S.O. gives a rough idea of the work involved in and the revenue likely to be realised by the regularisation of unauthorised occupations in Kumeri and other assessed lands in the area not to be resurveyed. Out of the 299 non-municipal villages in Mangalore and Puttur taluks the Settlement Inspectors have completed the inspection in 278 villages although the statement is based on the result of the inspection in only 165 of these villages. As only 21 villages remain for insp. in the two taluks these villages may also be inspected. It is however unnecessary to extend this systematic inspection of assessed lands to the other taluks of Coondapoor, Udipi and Karkal.

The statement submitted by the S.S.O. may be submitted to Govt. with reference to para 4(4) of their order on p. 27 of Bk. 1012 of 8.4.29. The Board may recommend the S.S.O's proposal that occupations of over 20 Cents in extent may be regularised by the Settlement officers after measurement in the course of supplemental Survey before the rough patta objection hearing

lists of occupations between 5 and 20 each prepared by the Sett. Staff in Mangalore and Puttur taluks may be sent to the Rev. Dept as soon as the lists are ready for Gooden the occupations under Sivaganga. In the taluks of Coondapoor, Udupi and Karkal where systematic inspection is not proposed to be done, occupations as to enable us to detected in the Course of inspn for reclamation or other purposes may summarily be enjoined by the Settlement officers. The enjoinment by settlement officers should be made in accordance with the instructions given in Bd. No. 4 dt 14.1.29 as recently amended in Bd. No. 85 dt 29.10.30. There are no grounds for not observing any of the formalities prescribed in those instructions.

Rly
4.3.31.

produces as much of a quarter of the occupied area that Putthur can show us.

I am not sure that the 'percentage' figure shown in col. 16 opposite head III is the proper way of looking at the results;there,the S.S.O. shows the assessmt. of the occupied area now found,in contrast with the assess--ment on the total of the ass'd wastes of the area examined. M.3 knows well the lie of the land in the south and east of Putthur,for example;and in S. Kan., as in Malabar,laterite hill-tops and vast jungly wastes are all assessed. It would be sounder,to my mind,not to compare figures in this way,but to look at col. 15(wh. shows the actual permanent occupation, excluding hakkal, now found in the area reported on) and see if it indicates that further scrutiny of the wastes is worth while,apart altogether from the percentage business referred to above In other words, does an extra revenue of Rs.1,706 odd a year from the area examined justify extending the operations to the other taluks?

(It seems at first sight,incidentally,that the figure in col; 15 opposite head V is wrong. The V figures are,of course,pure estimates;but,seeing that the assessment on the III ass. wastes is (col. 4) over $3\frac{1}{2}$ times the assmt. on the III ass. wastes,I can--not see how the S.S.O. makes out that the probable ex--tra revenue on V (col. 15) is less than double that on III. In fact,I am inclined to wash out my "inci--dentally" above and suggest that S.S.O. should be asked about this first

Unless I am wrong in pointing out this apparent error in calculation,the probable extra rev--enue for the whole Dt. would be round about Rs.5,000 a year,and it would be worth while doing even if we

spent Rs.80,000 on it over inspectn and suppl.

On the whole, I don't think we can se on to Govt. until we have got the figures confirm or corrected.

I suggest that these figures require very serious examination, as, I fear, this may well Govt's last chance of getting any revenue at all from these unreported encroachments on wastes -- lc the opportunity of re-settmt. and we lose the onl chance we will ever have.

A.M. 8.3.31.

M.3. 9.3.31

fop. 15-16 ct | Issued as Bd's ref S. No 5140/302d
fop 17-18 ct | S. 1159/31 from the S.S.O

A5 (ten)

Please see the S.S.O. report at pp 17-18 ct.

2/. The S.S.O. state that the figures shown in the statement at p 13 ct are correct. The assessment shown in col. 6 against item V is nearly 7½ times greater than that shown in col. 6 again item III. There will not be any disparity if the assessment in col 10 against item V is worked out on the basis of the figures given in cols 5 and 6 against item III. In that case the assessment in col 6 ag. item V will come to Rs. 1763/ as against Rs 3028/- and the probable extra revenue for the whole district will work out approximately to Rs 4,500/ instead of Rs 3211-13-0 shown in col. 15 against item V. The correctness of the figures

5 and 6 against items
and V seems doubtful
hapo the S.S.O. may be
quested to verify these figures
with those given in the revenue
accounts for fasli 1339 and
report the result to the Board
at an early date
Ulb
28-3 31 25-3 31 S.

Please see the S.S.Os explanatn
paps (1) to 18 C.F. The figures given by h
p. 13 C.F. are correct according to the m
adopted by him. The question is on the
of between figures, the figs in Cols 11 and 12
against item V should be arrived at. He has
Calculated new costs references to the extent show
in Col. 3 against items III and IV. Non-discrepancy
pointed out the extent in Col. 11 against V may
be arrived at as has been done by the S.S.O. while
the assessment in Col. 12 may be Calculated by
reference to other figs in Col 4 against III & IV

According to the jamabandi report for
fasli 1339 the total area occupied without any pa
in the District is 7057 acres bearing an assessm
Rs 7930. Tahellwise figs are not available. Accor
to the P.S.O's statement the total occupation in
non-assessed area is 3098 acres bearing an ass

The "non-reserved area" means the whole Dt. except old Mag. Tk. (i.e. present Mag. Tks of Pattikonda Tk. Mag. Tk. could S.S.O. have the 4/7 Tks of the Dt. total. Pl. let got his source imab. figures and where he used "figures.

A.W/24.31.

(sett)

draft subd

Ks/10.4.31 hs/10.4.31 Ltr 11.4.31

19-20 Cf. p. 21 Cf. Issued as Bd's Ref S.No 5140/30-3 dt 11.4-31 S. 1452/31. from the Collr. of S. Kanara

AS (sett)

Please see the letter from the Collr. of S. Kanara at p. 21

2/. The S.S.O's report may be awaited.

Ltr 21.4.31. Ltr/21.4.31 hs/21.4.31

2/. The S.S.O's final repo
may be awaited
23.4.31. CI

cell 28.4.31 hs 28.4.31

A.S (cell)

The S.S.O has not yet
sbd his ... report ...
rapk dtd
19.5.31

cell 18.5.31 hs 18.5.31

[Issued as ad G lr S.12.5/4
S.1926/31. from S.S.O.

A.S (cell)

Please see the S.S.O's letter
at p 27) CI

2/. The S.S.O's report may
be awaited till 15.6.31

cell 3.5.31 hs 30.5.31 + 19.5.31

A.S (sele)-

Please see the S.S.O's
letter at pp 29-30 C.F and
the comparative statement at
p 31 C.F.

2/. The S.S.O. has
explained in paragraph 2
of his letter how he has
arrived at his figures under

non-renumeged areas'. In the Karkal Tk. there is no difference in the extent under sivaijama occupation between the jamabandi statement no. 5 for fasli 1339 and the S.S.O's statement. The difference in the figures relating to the talukas of Puttur, Coondapur and Udipi is explained as due to the exclusion in the S.S.O's statement of the extent under sivaijama occupation in assessed wastes and kumaki in the renumeged areas and of the extent of unassessed land under such occupation in the entire talukas. In the Mangalore taluk the difference is considerable and the S.S.O. has excluded the figures relating to

(1) Renumeged villages
(2) Municipal villages & portions.
(3) Unassessed lands in the entire taluk

Areas assigned as darkhast but not brought under holding

Areas of kumaki lands applied for inclusion in holdings but

but brought to sivaijana on the ground that they were required for a public purpose. Thus, the figures in the S.S.O's statement relate only to sivaijana occupies in assessed wastes and kumaaku in the non-resumed areas of the five talukes in question. The S.S.O has stated that the figures shown in his statement are correct.

p18 C/

+ Cl. 16 exp view

3/ The percentage of increase in assessment according to the method of calculation adopted by the S.S.O is 0.62, while according to the method indicated in the Assistant Secretary's note at p. 10 above it is 0.90. The extra revenue may be estimated at Rs 4674 in respect of the five talukes in question. For orders whether the S.S.O's proposals may be recommended to Govt. for sanction.

Rs. Rs
2114 × 518178 / 142337 = 7697

Rs 7697 − Rs 3023 = Rs 4674

The percentage of increase is 4674 × 100 / 518178 = .90.

Secy may await the orders of Govt. on the question of resumption before submitting a report on the question raised in this file.
Ltr 12.6.31.

4/ Recently Govt. have been addressed for sanctioning the resumption of the five talukes in question. If Govt. sanction the resumption of these talukes the procedure orders

File not put up

in paragraphs 4 (2) + (3) of
~~the~~ G.O. No Mis 661 Rev, dt 27.3.29
will have to be adopted.

Clo
10631. 11.6.31

CRev
12.6.31

S

As far as the likely new area goes,
I think we can say that it will probably
be between 40000 & 50000 acres for the
district.

We might say to Govt. that we have
the S.S.O.'s report before us & that we
propose to put off submitting it, pending
their orders on resurvey. I think that in our
proposals for resurvey we gave them a rough
idea of the extent to wh introduction will
have to be postponed if we they sanction
resurvey: if so, it wld be as well to take
opportunity of asking for early orders

14.6.31.

14.6.31.

Please see Assistant Secretary's query in the personal register and the remarks of Secretary in the statement of pendency submitted to him on 4.2. Serial no 6/30

The file contains the report of the S.S.O called for in para 4 (4) of G.O. Mis. 661 Rev D/27.3.29 and the Board proposed to put off submitting it to Govt pending their orders on para 6 of its Rep.ce G.4838/30-J.15.5.31. regarding the resurvey of certain taluks of the South Kanara Dt. Govt have since passed orders in G.O. No 2214 Press Rev D/21.10.31 postponing 1934-35 the resettlement of the portions of the Salem and the S. Kanara A.U. No copies of the G.O was communicated to the S.S.O in Bd's Rep. F.6205/31-1D/. 2.10.31. In view of G.O 2214 Pr. Rev D/21.10.31 ordering postponement of resettlement operations

the S.S.O. may be requested to take up the question after the ~~commencement~~ question of the re-survey and re-settlement operations in the Dt. is decided Copy may also be marked for eyot Draft submitted.

11.2.32

12.2.32

12.2.32

S.

12.2.32.

Mangalore

1.	Total number of villages	151
2.	Number of villages in which survey was completed by depts.	57
3.	" " " Addl. Supervision	22
4.	" " " Special Sett Officers & SA &c.	7
5.	Number of villages in which there are no occupations out of those shown in item 2.	11
6.	Number of villages in which there are	
(a)	occupations of between 5 & 20 cents	2
(b)	Their extent	84.98 acs.
7	Number of villages in which there are	
(a)	occupations of over 20 cents	41
(b)	Their extent	300.59 ac

Statistics have been gathered for 101

11.11.30 19.11.30